

## **Review Process Type**

This Journal follows the **Double Blind Peer Review Process**, which means reviewer as well as author identities are concealed from each other throughout the review process.

## **Process**

Reviewers deal with manuscripts blindly and provide the feedback Comments through the mail.

Based on the reviewers' feedback and recommendations, the Associate editor will inform the corresponding author that whether the paper will be accepted, rejected or needs to be revise and resubmit.

## **The Duties/ Roles & Responsibility of Reviewer/Editor.**

The peer reviewer is responsible for critically reading and evaluating a manuscript in their specialty field and then providing respectful, constructive and honest feedback to authors about their submission.

It is appropriate for the Peer Reviewer to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the article, ways to improve the strength and quality of the work and evaluate the relevance and originality of the manuscript.

## **Before Reviewing**

Please consider the following:

Does the article you are being asked to review match your expertise? If you receive a manuscript that covers a topic that does not sufficiently match your area of expertise, please notify the Associate Editor as soon as possible. Please feel free to recommend alternate reviewer.

## **The Review Process**

When reviewing the article, please keep the following in mind:

### **Content Quality and Originality**

1. Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting/knowledgeable to warrant publication?
2. Does the article adhere to the journal's standards?

### **Article Clarity**

1. Title: Does it clearly narrate the article?
2. Abstract & Introduction: Do they describe the content of the article?

3. Methodology: Does author accurately explain all methods and materials used in the research work?  
Does all methods and materials are relevant to the study?

4. Results: Does author compile all result clearly?

5. Conclusion/Discussion: Do they seem reasonable? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?

6. Tables and Figures: Are they appropriate? Do they properly show the data? Are they easy to interpret and understand?

### **Ethical Issues –**

**-Plagiarism:** If you suspect that an article is a substantial copy of another work, please let the commissioning editor know, citing the previous work in as much detail as possible.

**- Fraud:** It is very difficult to detect the determined fraudster, but if you suspect the results in an article to be untrue, discuss it with the editor.

### **Note-**

- All submissions are confidential and please do not discuss any aspect of the submissions with a third party.
- If you would like to discuss the article with a colleague, please ask the Associate Editor first.